

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 remain in the application with claims 1 and 3 have been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Shiozaki et al.

As explained in the present specification an object of the present invention is to reduce the overall size of a camera, for example. This is accomplished by positioning the circuit boards, the image display unit, and the record medium connector on various surfaces of a battery case formed generally as a parallelepiped. As shown in Figs. 2A and 2B, the dimension B is reduced relative to the dimension A of the prior art shown in Fig. 4B. This is accomplished by positioning the circuit boards and the like on separate surfaces of the battery case in a nonoverlapping relationship. It will be noted that the prior art had some overlapping of these various circuit boards and the like causing the increase in the thickness dimension.

In the electronic camera of Shiozaki et al., a battery accommodating part 28 is also provided. As shown in Fig. 7 of Shiozaki et al., there is an overlapping relationship among the various boards that are affixed to the sides of the battery accommodating part. For example, it will be seen that the photographing board 71 is overlapped by a portion of the power supply board 73. Similarly, the strobe board 74 is overlapped

by the switch FPC board 75.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Shiozaki et al. would not render obvious the placement of the circuit boards and the like in the present invention, because Shiozaki et al. clearly shows that the prior art approach of overlapping the circuit boards is to be followed as well.

Accordingly, by reason of the amendments made to the claims hereby, as well as the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that an electronic device having a battery storage container and nonoverlapping circuit boards, as taught by the present invention and as recited in the amended claims, is neither shown nor suggested in the cited reference.

The reference cited as of interest has been reviewed and is not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP



Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM:tb